

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 11-18 were allowed. Claims 2-3 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1 and 4-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claims 19-54 were provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting.

Rejection of claims 1 and 4-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 1 and 4-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by Lindsey US 2003/0169618. Without conceding to or agreeing with the Examiner's rejection, claims 1 and 4-10 are cancelled without prejudice to advance prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to file further applications having the cancelled claims.

In view of the above, the rejection is believed moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Double patenting rejection

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 19-54 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over copending application 10/654586.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In view of the arguments and amendments presented here, it is believed the claims are allowable. The provisional double patenting rejection is believed to be the only rejection remaining in the present application. According to MPEP 804, if a provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the application, the examiner should withdraw the rejection and permit the application to issue as a patent.

Without conceding to the rejection, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Objection of claims 2-3

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 2-3 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but were said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.


Without conceding to the rejection of the rejected base claim, to advance prosecution, claim 2 has been amended to include all limitations of claim 1. Claim 3 depends from claim 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and arguments, it is believed the claims are allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested. If there are any issues remaining to passage of the case to issuance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

This response is accompanied by a Petition for Extension of Time (three months) and authorization to charge the Deposit Account 07-1969 in the amount of \$510.00 for a small entity. This response is also accompanied by a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and authorization to charge Deposit Account 07-1969 the appropriate fee (believed to be \$180.00). If this amount is incorrect, however, please credit any overpayment or deduct the appropriate fee, including the fee for any extensions of time required, from Deposit Account 07-1969.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan K. Doughty
Reg. No. 43,595

GREENLEE, WINNER AND SULLIVAN, P.C.
4875 Pearl East Circle, Suite 200
Boulder, CO 80301
Telephone: (303) 499-8080
Facsimile: (303) 499-8089
E-mail: winner@greenwin.com
Attorney Docket No. 14-04B